UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,240	11/13/2003	Curtis Woods	12406/99	9480
<sup>26646</sup> KENYON & K	7590 05/18/200 ENYON LLP	7	EXAMINER	
ONE BROADY	WAY	FLORES SANCHEZ, OMAR		
NEW YORK, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			····	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/18/2007	PAPER,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	<del></del>			
r.							
	Office Action Summary	10/712,240	WOODS ET AL.				
•	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	=	Omar Flores-Sánchez	3724				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence addres	s			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOTS as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a r will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON a. cause the application to become AF	CATION.  reply be timely filed  ITHS from the mailing date of this commur  AANDONED (35 U.S.C. \$ 133)				
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Fe	ebruary 2007		•			
	Γhis action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Dienositi	on of Claims						
· · · _							
	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	wn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		•				
	Claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•				
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement					
٥,۵	are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acco	epted or b)□ objected to I	oy the Examiner.	•			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyan	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-15	52.			
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
_	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s°have been received.					
•	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		pplication No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior			e			
	application from the International Bureau	ม (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		•			
* S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment	(s)						
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview S	ummary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		)/Mail Date formal Patent Application				
Paper	No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/712,240

Art Unit: 3724

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

 $\sim$  1. This action is in response to applicant's amendment received on 02/20/07.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 3. Claims 8, 16, 22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 4. Claims 8, 16, 22 and 25-27 recite the limitation "the angular wall". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1-7, 9, 10, 12-15, 17-24, 28, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts (PCT WO 01/76708 A1) in view of Schick (2,049,140).

Art Unit: 3724

Regarding claims 1, 4, 5, 13, 18, 19, 24, 28, 29 and 30, Roberts discloses the invention substantially as claimed including at least one drawer 300, at least one slot 340, at least one ticket bin 322. The bins of Roberts are capable of being in any position inside the drawer. Roberts doesn't show a housing having a transparent panel and drawers, which are movable between extended and retracted positions. However, Schick teaches the use of a housing having a transparent panel 14 and drawers 16, which are movable between extended and retracted positions for the purpose of providing protection to a plurality of articles and full display of the articles. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Roberts by providing the housing having the transparent panel and drawers, which are movable between extended and retracted positions as taught by Schick in order to obtain a device that provides protection to a plurality of tickets and full display of the tickets.

### Also, Roberts discloses:

- Claim 2; a plurality of drawers vertically arranged in the housing (see Fig. 21).
   Also, the Schick teaches a plurality of drawers 16 vertically arranged in the housing (see Fig. 2).
- Claim 3; a plurality of ticket bins (320, 322, 324, 326) horizontally arranged on each drawer.
- Claims 6, 14 and 20; a bulkhead 314.
- Claims 7, 15 and 21; a generally planar bottom 302 and a pair of spaced flanges 321.

Art Unit: 3724

- Claims 9, and 13; a power separator 176.
- Claims 10 and 13; a powered ticket transport mechanism 178.
- 7. Claims 11, 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer et al. (6,230,926 B1) in view of Schick (2,049140) and Robert et al. (6,726,077) as applied to claims 1, 13 and 19 above, and further in view of Osawa (6,527,129 B2).

The modified device of Roberts discloses (Fig. 1-14) the invention substantially as claimed except for a plurality of sockets and tabs. Osawa teaches the use of a plurality of sockets 102 and tabs 112C for the purpose of quickly attaching different size products. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Roberts by providing the plurality of sockets and tabs as taught by Osawa in order to obtain a device that quickly attaching different size products.

## Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 8, 16, 22 and 25-27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

# Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/712,240

Art Unit: 3724

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. Roberts et al. is cited to show a related device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Omar Flores-Sánchez whose telephone number is 571-272-4507.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on 571-272-4502. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BOYER D. ASHLEY

ISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5

ofs 5/14/07